THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1913

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virgina and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Seventy-two Branch Committees; 20,072 members in 375 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS.
MISS. AGNES IRWIN.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y. Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

RECENT MILITANT FREAKS

IT would be a dreary business reciting the details of the offences against the public peace and the attacks upon private property by which the English militants have been seeking to demonstrate their fitness for the ballot during the last three months.

But some of the incidents of this hysterical campaign stand out as particularly silly or particularly outrageous. One of these was the performance of forty suffragettes who contrived to be seated in a body in St. Paul's cathedral in London on the first Sunday in August, and interrupted the service by chanting over and over in loud tones "Save Emmeline Pankhurst! Spare her! Spare her! Give her light and set her free! Hear us while we pray to thee!" It was not until the sacrilegious crowd was forcibly ejected by the ushers that the service was allowed to proceed.

Another incident, still more disgraceful if possible, was the personal assault made by two suffragette viragoes upon Premier Asquith on the golf course at Elgin, Scotland, on the 28th of August. These women rushed at Mr. Asquith, called him liar and scoundrel, struck him, and seizing him by his coat, dragged him about the course,—the Premier, meanwhile, preserving the ancient traditions of chivalry by refraining from striking back, though his daughter went to her father's defense. Commenting on this incident, the Boston Herald of August 30 very truly said:

"The suffragettes who glory in violence are not of a sort that any law-abiding people could be eager to enfranchise. It cannot be said that the two who assaulted Mr. Asquith are desirable citizens. . . . Their action is not an argument for votes, but for strait-jackets. As it damages and hinders the cause which they avowedly wish to advance, it shows that they are incapable of knowing what they do. And while it is a caricature of political agitation, it is a degradation of womanhood. If woman suffrage wins, it will be in spite of the militants."

ONE DOLLAR PER HUNDRED

THE Providence Journal of July 10 referred editorially to the statement in THE REMONSTRANCE that the Illinois suffragists last fall offered a dollar for every hundred names appended to petitions for the submission of the suffrage question to the voters, and added: "This is probably not true."

If the Journal will take the trouble to procure a copy of the Chicago Post of August 16, 1912, it will find therein the following advertisement signed by Mrs. McCulloch, the Illinois suffrage leader:

"I will pay for services in obtaining genuine signatures of registered Illinois voters on our Woman Suffrage Policy Petition at the rate of one dollar a hundred signatures until 20,000 additional names are secured prior to Sept. 1, 1912."

The same advertisement appeared in other papers, and its authenticity never has been questioned.

Yet, in spite of this liberal offer,—and every one knows how easy it is to procure signatures to almost anything—the Illinois suffragists were unable, in the whole state, to get the names of 100,000 registered voters, and the movement was abandoned. And this is the state in which the legislature, under pressure from a secret lobby, without a mandate from the voters and afraid to submit the proposal to them, has enacted a bill of doubtful constitutionality giving women the right to vote for all statutory offices.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

THE suffragists have allowed themselves to become unduly exuberant over the favorable report of the Woman Suffrage Committee of the United States Senate upon the proposed suffrage amendment to the federal Constitution.

This favorable report had no significance. The Senate Committee did simply what it was appointed to do. Five of the nine members,—Senator Thomas of Colorado, Senator Chamberlain of Oregon, Senator Ashurst of Arizona, Senator Sutherland of Utah and Senator Jones of Washington—are Senators from suffrage states, and it was a foregone conclusion that they would vote for the suffrage amendment. So far as their

votes are concerned, the hearings before the Committee might as well have been dispensed with.

But before woman suffrage can be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States, it must receive

First, the favorable vote of two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives.

Second, the favorable vote of two-thirds of the United States Senate.

Third, the approval of three-fourths of the state legislatures.

It is one thing that a handful of Senators from suffrage states should frame a report favorable to suffrage, and quite another that two-thirds of both houses of Congress and three-fourths of the state legislatures should be ready to incorporate so revolutionary a change in the federal Constitution. At present, only nine states out of forty-eight are committed to woman suffrage. The combined population of all nine is considerably less than that of the cities of New York, Chicago and Philadelphia.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION IN ILLINOIS

THE points upon which Attorney General Lucey of Illinois based his doubts of the constitutionality of the recently-enacted woman suffrage bill in that state were not clearly stated in the press at the time the opinion was given, possibly because the opinion was somewhat voluminous. An examination of the text of the opinion, which is now at hand, shows how serious the constitutional objections to the bill are.

Section 13 of article 4 of the constitution of Illinois provides that "no law shall be revived or amended by reference to its title only, but the law revived or the section amended shall be inserted at length in the new act."

The woman suffrage act is described in its title as "An Act granting women the right to vote for presidential electors and certain other officers, and to participate and vote in certain matters and elections." It purports to be an independent act, standing alone and not amendatory of any other act while, as a matter of fact, it amends the provisions of the general election act, the act defining the qualifications of voters in cities and villages, the township organization act, the ballot law, and all the various acts providing for the submission of questions to the vote of the people,—no one of which acts is mentioned in the new Act.

The Attorney General cited three decisions of the Supreme Court of Illinois which seem to support the view that the suffrage Act is unconstitutional. These were the cases of School Directors v. School Directors, 135 Ill. 464; Badenoch v. City of Chicago, 222 Ill. 71; and People v. Knopf, 183 Ill. 410. From the second of these opinions, which involved the Garnishment Act of 1905, he quoted at length. The Court ruled:

"In the act under consideration, the attachment and garnishment of the salaries and wages of officers and employees of certain municipal corporations are the subjects dealt with, and, while the title of the act purports to be the title of a complete act, it appears from the body of the act that it is not a complete act within itself, but that the act is by itself and when considered alone, wholly ineffective and inoperative, except by engrafting the new act upon the attachment and garnishment acts heretofore in force in this state."

The Court continued:

"It thus appears that the act of 1905 is not a complete act within itself, and that it amounts to nothing more than an attempt to change the existing statutes of the State, upon the subject of attachment and garnishment, so as to make them broad enough to include within their terms the attachment and garnishment of the salaries and wages of the officers and employees of the municipal corporations named in the new act, by intermingling the provisions of the new act with those of the old statutes upon those subjects, the effect of which clearly is to bring the new statute within the view expressed in the Knopf case, (People v. Knopf, 183 Ill. 410) and to render it unconstitutional and void as amounting to amendments of the general statutes upon the subjects of attachment and garnishment heretofore in force in this State."

It will be noticed how closely the language of this opinion applies to the Woman Suffrage Act. It is impossible to see how the Supreme Court, following the same line of reasoning, can fail to reach the same conclusion. The Attorney General reviewed the arguments, pro and con, and prudently refrained from expressing a final opinion. He also cited certain other measures enacted by the Illinois legislature against which the same objections would hold. That, however, is beside the point. If the Illinois legislature has been in the habit of legislating in defiance of the well-established principle that an act amendatory of a previous act must specify the act amended, the sooner its delinquencies are corrected, the better.

As regards the woman suffrage act, suffragists as well as anti-suffragists should hope for a speedy and authoritative settlement of the question of constitutionality. It would be a serious matter if local elections, at which women have voted, since the passage of the act, were to be invalidated by a decision that women had no right to vote at them.

It is hoped that a test case may be carried to the Supreme Court in season to ensure a decision before the first of January.

A SIGNIFICANT DISCLAIMER

(From the Woman's Journal, July 19, 1913.)

A CORRECTION.

A misunderstanding has apparently arisen about the organizations represented in the so-called pilgrimage to Washington which started from Boston on Wednesday, July 16. It is said to be representative of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, and the College League of Massachusetts. No one of these organizations has authorized any person to represent it in the automobile party in charge of Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL,
For Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association.

WARRENE PIPER PERMAR,
For College Equal Suffrage League of Massachusetts.

(From The Congregationalist, Sept. 11, 1913)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND THE FORCES OF EVIL

To the Editor of The Congregationalist:

Governor Dunne of Illinois signed the bill conferring upon women the right to vote for all "statutory offices" June 23. Just twenty days later, at Pilsen Park, Chicago, the first steps were taken in forming women's organizations to aid the "wets" in future municipal campaigns. On that night the Women's Liberty League was organized, in affiliation with what is known as the United Societies for Local Self-Government. The United Societies is sustained by the liquor interests, and the "self-government" for which it stands is the right to carry on the liquor business with the minimum of interference. A. J. Cormak, secretary of the United Societies, and a prime mover in the organization of the Women's Liberty League, explained in the Chicago Record-Herald of July 13 that the United Societies did not aid in the passage of the suffrage bill, and that their women did not want the right to vote. "But," he added, *"now that suffrage is a reality we shall organize our women, and expect to have no difficulty in getting results at the polls.* The women will be ready to take part in the aldermanic primaries and election next spring, and in the mayoralty primaries and election in 1915."

Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, president of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association and one of the leaders in the lobby at Springfield which brought about the enactment of the suffrage bill, said in the Chicago American of June 28, "It is a great pleasure to remember that some of the firmest supporters of the suffrage measure in the Forty-eighth General Assembly were some of the so-called 'wets.'"

Now the "wets" are no fools. They know exactly what they want and the shortest way of getting it. They share Mr. Cormak's cheerful confidence that they will have no difficulty "in getting results at the polls." It has been mentioned as an encouraging sign that, after the granting of woman suffrage in California, there was a great quickening of interest in municipal affairs among women, and a large demand at the book-stores for books upon politics, history and social questions. But no time will be wasted in such ways among the women for whom Mr. Cormak speaks, and whom he is busy in organizing. They will be taught only how to register, whose orders to take and how to cast their votes, and they will be corralled as new and welcome recruits to the forces of evil.

There is a difference of policy just now among the Illinois liquor interests. In the southern part of the state, and in the smaller towns, there is a disposition among them to push the question of the constitutionality of the new law, in the hope of overthrowing it. This is because they remember the old days of the suffrage movement, when it was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with its definite anti-saloon program, which led. But in Chicago and the other large cities the liquor interests recognize the changed conditions and the new leadership, and they are losing no time in organizing their own women to increase their strength at the polls.

No sane person questions the sincerity of Miss Addams, Mrs. McCulloch and other women of their type who labored for woman suffrage in Illinois. They wanted to purify politics and to improve the condition of women. But what have they really done? They have put into the hands of the forces of evil, the foes of society, the home and the church, a new and powerful weapon. And now it will be necessary to appeal to the hundreds of thousands of Illinois women who did not want the ballot, and shrank from its responsibilities as an unnecessary and heavy burden, to take time which is needed in their homes, in the care of their children and in religious and charitable activities, to try to beat back the forces thus recruited. It will be a desperate and doubtful battle at the best.

Let Massachusetts people not deceive themselves. If the clamor of a small minority of Massachusetts women should ever prevail, and woman suffrage be incorporated in the State constitution, we should see the forces of evil rallying their new recruits quickly, as they are now doing in Illinois; and the good women of the state, the busy, conservative, homeloving women, the women who are now organizing all over the state to resist the suffrage movement as a menace to their sex and to the public good, would be appealed to, in spite of their wishes and their scruples and their other obligations, to rally against the enemy.

The time to take such matters into consideration is beforehand, not afterward.

FRANK FOXCROFT.

Cambridge, Mass.

WHAT CHICAGO WOMEN HAVE DONE

THE Chicago Tribune prints an impressive list of the achievements of women in bettering civic conditions in that city during the last few years.

It is to the women, and especially to the women's clubs, according to the Tribune, that the city owes the kindergarten in the public schools, the juvenile court and detention home, the small park and playground movement, the vacation school, the school extension development, the establishment of a forestry department of the city government, the city welfare exhibit, the development of the Saturday half-holiday, the establishment of public comfort stations, the work of the Legal Aid Society, and the reformation of the Illinois Industrial School.

This is a long and brilliant list of women's achievements. It is perhaps only through an oversight that the Tribune forgets to direct attention to the fact that this splendid work was done by Chicago women without the ballot.

But this is not all. This work of civic betterment could not have been done by the women so well, if at all, if they had had the ballot. In that case, all these issues would have worn a partisan aspect. The women would have approached them as Republicans, or as Democrats, or as Progressives and their appeal would have been a party appeal, addressed to their party associates, men and women, and very likely opposed by men and women of other parties merely for political reasons. Their movement would have been open to the suspicion of personal or interested motives. It would have been asked what they were expecting to get for it and what political party was going to get the credit for it.

Let any one watch the proceedings of any of our state legislatures and notice how seldom party lines are broken down even in the consideration of philanthropic measures. The party in power wants the credit for any good work that is done. The party in opposition has the habit of opposing and votes against bills which it might be willing to support, if it were in the majority. Transfer these conditions to women's activities and the same thing would hold true.

Such achievements as those that the Chicago Tribune records are in the direct line of woman's finest service to the city and state. They are warmly approved by women anti-suffragists and are shared by them. But in all such work the ballot would be, not only not a help, but a handicap.

SOME MORE MAN-MADE LAWS

AMONG the laws enacted at this year's session of the New York legislature for the protection of women and children were the following:

A law extending and strengthening the law requiring seats for female employees.

A law which makes physical examination for employment certificates of children necessary in every case instead of cases of doubtful health as formerly.

A law prohibiting the manufacture in tenements of articles of food, dolls and dolls' clothing, and articles of children's or infants' wearing apparel.

A law which requires every employer to allow every person employed in a factory or mercantile establishment,—with a few specified exceptions—at least twenty-four consecutive hours of rest in seven days.

A law prohibiting a child under fourteen from working in any factory.

A law which provides that no female minor shall work in any factory before six o'clock in the morning or after nine o'clock in the evening.

A law prohibiting the employment of women or children about dangerous machinery, prohibiting the employment of minors in trades which are dangerous or injurious to health, and prohibiting the employment of females in foundries, in connection with the making of cores, except under certain regulations.

A law regulating the employment of children in street trades, raising from ten to twelve years the minimum age of boys permitted to sell papers, etc., on streets, and forbidding children from selling papers after eight o'clock in the evening, instead of after ten o'clock as formerly.

These are wholesome laws. They are the latest additions to a vast volume of similar legislation, designed for the special protection of women and children. But they are all "man-made" laws, enacted by a legislature composed wholly of men, and elected by men, and prompted by that regard for the health and safety of women and children which is characteristic of American legislators.

HOW WOMEN HAVE CHANGED

(From the San Francisco Argonaut.)

A number of English women have sent a joint letter of protest to all London magistrates denouncing the practice of asking women to withdraw from court during the presentation of indecent evidence. They say that the practice is sex discrimination and an outrage.

Well, so it is. If women wish to hear indecent evidence, they have a right to do so, especially in view of the fact that most indecent books are written by women. But we should like to assuage the indignation of these particular protestors. We should like to be peacemakers in the matter. The practice of which they complain is not due to cussedness, as they seem to suppose. There was a time when women,—real women—felt themselves at liberty to attend trials because they relied upon the judge to warn them of the approach of indecencies. They wished to have that warning,—in those days. They did not like indecencies,—at that time.

And so the practice came into existence, but it was not a feminine disability but a feminine privilege. It was a part of a general system of courtesy under which a man would cease swearing, on the approach of a woman. It was understood that the woman did not like swearing, or indecency, or the sight of violence and bloodshed and a score of things of like kind.

But now it seems that times have changed. There is no longer need for the same consideration, since women have developed other likes and dislikes. Therefore if women wish to hear indecent evidence,—and it seems that they do—they have a perfect right to hear it. Indeed no one ever questioned their right, although it may be that the judicial warning to women to withdraw from court may slowly have assumed the form of a command. By all means let them stay in court. Let them serve on coroners' juries, if they have no objection to "view the body."

Let them act as cattle slaughterers, as executioners, and floggers. No one has a right to forbid them if they wish to do these things. The present discriminations date from the days when women did not wish to do these things. But the times and the women have changed.

INCONSISTENCY?

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

SOME of the 20,000 Massachusetts organized Anti-suffragists feel that it is their duty to vote for the public school committees, and because they have done so, they have been accused by the suffragists of being inconsistent. It is precisely because all conscientious women would feel obliged to vote, if there were woman suffrage in Massachusets, that most of them object to having it: so that it seems to me not at all inconsistent, but only proper, for them to vote for school committee. In any case it is not as inconsistent for them to vote, as it is for the suffragists to refrain from voting. And, as only about 3 per cent of the women of Massachusetts do vote, it is clear, either, that there are very few suffragists in Massachusetts, far fewer than they themselves make out, or that they are mostly inconsistent!

Granting that the whole 20,000 members of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffragist Association are as inconsistent as the suffragists—going even further still and granting that all women are more or less inconsistent—is that any reason for enfranchising them?

CAROLINE M. PARKER,

WHAT ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS WANT

(From the Woman's Protest.)

WE therefore stand as a body of conservationists. Our aim is to conserve the home, to conserve motherhood, to conserve womanhood. We seek to preserve all that is best in the old order of things, to incorporate what is excellent in the new; we seek to continue our part of the foundation of the social fabric along these lines and not along the lines of socialism, of feminism, and of economic independence for all women.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

THE playful skit at women agitators which follows is reproduced exactly,—ancient type and all—from the Columbia Centinel, Boston, February 1, 1792. It suggests that the 18th century feminist was not so very unlike the 20th century type:

From the St. James's CHRONICLE.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

PSHAW, ſays I, Mr. BALDWIN, rights of a fiddleſtick!—rights of *man*, indeed! I ſhould not have thought of the *he* creatures talking ſo much about their rights, while the *rights* of *women* lie neglected. This indeed would be a ſubject, were not, as my friend Mr. BURKE ſays, the "age of chivalry gone!"

Have not *we rights*, Mr. BALDWIN, rights indiſputable, natural, abſtract, and ſocial, and civil, and municipal? Are not "all women equal?" Have they not a *natural* right to the privilege of ſpeech, and have they ever baſely bartered that right? And what did they do when even *Mouſers* were employed to deprive them of this right? Did they ſtay at home, mending ſtockings, darning gloves, making holes for ſleeve-buttons, and quilting counterpanes? No, ſir, they viſited ten times more!

Have they not the *ſocial* right of preference in all ſocieties? Do they not take precedence of every thing in breeches, every proud he creature that calls himſelf a lord of the creation? Have they not the higheſt right of all: the right of governing their huſbands? Who dare deny this? A right, ſir, for which they paid no ſmall price; for, to obtain it, and to have leiſure and time to exerciſe it, they gave up another right, the right of governing themſelves!

Among their *civil* rights are we not to reckon the right of ſcolding, crying, falling into fits, going to watering places and running up bills? Shall the haughty ariſtocracy of men deny us theſe rights!

No—Mr. BALDWIN, no, periſh the gnoble thought—women, ſir, *have* rights: And the time will come when the anſwerers of BURKE (I am told they are all *batchelors* or *old maids*) ſhall be aſhamed of themſelves, and view us with the gallant eyes of a BURKE, "juſt riſing above the horizon."

But I beg pardon, Mr. BALDWIN: I trouble you with this only becauſe my brother *Sam* will not write on the ſubject; forſooth he ſays we have more rights than we know what to do with. Well—we are but like others of the liberty men of this country who don't know when they are well off.

Your's, Mr. BALDWIN,
JENNY SARCASM.

SUFFRAGE AND INFANT MORTALITY

AMONG the many things promised by the suffragists is that, if women are given the vote, infant mortality will immediately diminish.

A priori, this might not seem the most likely result of woman suffrage. There are only so many hours in the day, and the average woman has only about so much strength. If you add the vote and the responsibilities of public affairs to woman's load, it might seem that you left to women so much less time for the cares of the home and the training of children; and it must be ultimately upon maternal care and tenderness that the health of children will depend.

But the suffragists always point doubters to the record of New Zealand. Women were given the vote in New Zealand in 1893. In that year, the rate of infant mortality in that colony was 76 in the thousand. In 1911 the rate had dropped to 56. Isn't that conclusive? What further proof of the beneficent effect of woman suffrage upon infant mortality could be asked?

But wait a moment. *Post hoc* is not always the same thing as *propter hoc*. One thing may follow another without being caused by it. Let us look a little further into the figures from New Zealand. In 1883, ten years before women were given the vote, the rate of infant mortality in New Zealand was 103. During the next ten years it dropped to 76. Shall we say that this improvement was due to the fact that New Zealand, during this decade, was living under laws man-made and man-administered? During the next ten years, under woman suffrage, the rate rose to 81. Shall we say that this less favorable showing was due to the giving women the vote? If the suffragist reasoning were correct, we should do so.

The New Zealand statistics show that, during the ten years before women had votes, the rate of infant mortality dropped by 27; eighteen years after women were given the vote, it had dropped another 20. But, in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, during the last seventeen years, the rate has dropped by 66 per thousand, that is, from 161 to 95. This rate is actually lower than that in Finland—111 per thousand—where women not only vote but sit in Parliament.

The real explanation of this improvement is not to be found in woman suffrage or the absence of it. It is the result of the advance of science, a better knowledge of hygiene, and wiser laws for the care and protection of children. Women may promote this world-wide movement toward better conditions, but they do not need the ballot to do it.

THE NEW SUFFRAGE LEADERSHIP

(Estelle H. Livingston in "Practical Politics," Boston.)

WITHIN a few years a new element has taken charge of the suffrage movement, and as far as possible, has crowded the veterans to the rear. . . . . Far preferable to me is voluntary separation from the movement, and to view its temporary setback, here and elsewhere, than partial or complete triumph under such auspices as those now in charge. . . . I believe that the present tendency to immodesty in dress—and it is growing to an alarming extent—is due to the militant leadership of the suffrage movement more than to any other cause. They have asked young girls to join them in all kinds of bold and unwomanly proceedings, and young girls, aping the manners of their elders in the cause, have done what they could to attract as much attention on parade as the women of form who lead the movement. If those who wear on the public streets such apparel as women of the town would not dare to wear along the streets most frequented by them should be arrested for indecent exposure or disorderly conduct, a crushing blow would be administered to what is now an important, and, in a way, an impressive element of the votes-for-women brigade. If all of that class would migrate to England and participate in the rowdyism of their British sisters, it would be a good thing for this country, a good thing for the American suffrage movement and a good thing for the cause of home and decency.

"THE CASE FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE"

UNDER this title the National College Equal Suffrage League publishes, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association sells, a bibliography of books, pamphlets and magazine articles dealing with woman suffrage, prepared by Miss Margaret Ladd Franklin, a Bryn Mawr graduate of 1908, and commended in an introduction by President Thomas "not only to college women for whom it is primarily intended, but also to all men and women who are working for equal suffrage." The book is compact and well arranged, with brief editorial comment and criticism, extracts from the works considered most important, and stars—from one to six— indicating the editor's estimate of them. It is of interest to Anti-suffragists because it gives, incidentally, a concise and authoritative presentation of the views favored by the "millions of younger women" whose "clearer vision" Miss Inez Milholland (now Mrs. Boisswein) has predicted will "bring real issues more sharply before us."

Suffragists of the older school attempted to disavow Miss Milholland's radical utterances as those of "an individual," and one of them went so far as to describe her as "a fledgling," and "a representative of a class of restless young women with a highly developed egotism," but her conspicuous public appearances have proved her still a recognized leader, and a glance between the yellow covers of this bibliography shows that her views have a large following.

Of Bernard Shaw's "The Quintessence of Ibsenism" (four stars) the editor says:

"Too many advocates of woman suffrage insist that when woman is enfranchised she will be no less 'womanly' than before, whereas in point of fact the chief thing to be said for the suffrage is that it will make woman less womanly, in the commonly accepted sense of the term. . . The great merit of this essay is that it faces this fact frankly. For example, instead of maintaining that woman's love of self-sacrifice is innate and ineradicable, Mr. Shaw proclaims that it is at present hypertrophied, and that women's emancipation will reduce it to a more normal size. Then he goes on to prove that this will be a good thing. 'The truth is that in real life a self-sacrificing woman is not only taken advantage of, but disliked as well for her pains. . . A whole basketful of ideals of the most sacred quality will be smashed by the achievement of equality for women and men.'"

From "The Woman's Invasion" by William Hard and Rheta Childe Dorr, is quoted:

"As long as women workers stop work at marriage they will continue to be as a class, low-paid, overworked, unskilled, looking only to the day and never to the future."

Professor Zueblin, the editor admits, "gives striking instances to show that women will no longer have to choose between a career (or a trade) and motherhood," but she does not agree with him in thinking "that the best plan would be, not that women in general should enter into the actual economic struggle, but that upon marriage, and subsequently on the birth of each child, the father be required to take out an insurance policy providing annuities for wife and children."

Nor does the editor agree with Miss Cicely Hamilton's theory that those women who choose marriage should "claim regular wages," though she awards three stars to her book, "Marriage as a Trade," calls it "a keen analysis," and pronounces "its criticism cleverly elaborated, especially in the section about woman's morality (which is to a great extent 'not morality at all, in the proper sense of the word, but merely a code of manners formulated in the interests of her masters.')"

Apparently that complete "economic independence" which rests on continuous self-support is favored by the editor. She sums up an article by Marion Foster Washburn thus:

"The contention is twofold: first, that the business of making homes and rearing children has both its masculine and its feminine side (the masculine being at present neglected); and, second, that there is really no sound objection to woman's taking her part in the business world. The point that the regular hours and methodical nature of business and the professions are really far less wearing than the incessant cares of housekeeping is well brought out."

Starred with six stars is "Women and Economics" by Charlotte Perkins Gilman—probably the most radical of the older American suffragists —and the "clear vision" of the young editor classes it with Mill's "Subjection of Women," calling them "the two epoch-making books on the woman question." Six stars, again, for a later work, by the same writer, "The Home." Quotations from the two fill four pages of the bibliography—double the space given to any other writer.

"A house does not need a wife any more than it needs a husband." "To work for the world at large is necessary to the development of work. A private poet is necessarily ignoble. So is a private cook." "The woman who works is usually a better reproducer than the woman who does not."

Even more significant is the space given to extracts from "The Freewoman," that startlingly radical organ of the English feminists which was suspended last October, to the immense relief of the moderate wing of the suffragists. Its attitude toward sex-relations is admitted to be "ultra-radical," but its articles on the economic position of women are "strong and admirably written," and they are lavishly quoted here.

"Feminism would hold that it is neither desirable nor necessary for women, when they are mothers, to leave their chosen, money-earning work for any length of time. The fact that they so often do so largely rests on tradition which has to be worn down. In wearing it down vast changes must take place in social conditions, in housing, nursing, kindergarten, in the industrial world, and in the professions. . . . Women will be compelled to make a clean choice between the comforts of protection and the harsh responsibilities of freedom."

In the face of utterances like these, put forward as they are, will old-fashioned suffragists still keep on saying that the movement at whose rear they lag brings no menace to the home?

A SUFFRAGE PARADOX

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

MR. W. L. GEORGE, the novelist, makes a bid for notoriety in his espousal of Woman Suffrage along paradoxical lines: "I do not believe that women are fit to have a vote. That is why I want them to have it." He then goes on to paint women as "politically narrow, passionate and mean" and to show how the vote will make them politically broad, dispassionate in their judgment, and open handed. It is probably a waste of time to take foolery seriously, and Mr. George is, of course, assuming Mr. Bernard Shaw's motley for the moment when he makes such casual and flippant arguments.

Mr. George calls women "politically narrow, passionate and mean." We will grant that that is how their best qualities would appear in public affairs. These same qualities in domestic or private life are invaluable and make of woman what she is,—a being with a marvelous capacity for ignoring side issues, a being with superb powers of personal devotion to an individual or an idea, a being who can make one dollar do the work of three where love rules. Mr. George artlessly complains that spending money terrifies some women, and that others, the "beloved slaves" of men, spend lavishly. He appears never to have come in contact with the responsible wife and mother who administers wisely. He goes on to expand on the subject of woman's "fierce race-protecting passion" which he thinks will instill into politics something very desirable and ennobling. He believes very much in passionate politics, but it does not apparently occur to him that the average wife and mother is far too much occupied by the intense actualities of her "fierce, race-protecting passion" to be willing or able to expend it in political warfare.

Without granting with the feminists that all womanhood can be divided into mean and petty savers, and self-indulgent slavish spenders, we may still admit that most women might be charged with "political narrowness, passion and meanness,"—from the man's point of view, i. e. when operating in his sphere of action. But how do these qualities exhibit themselves when put to their natural use? Does one think of criticizing a mother who teaches her sons the "narrow, political" ideal of love of home and country? Does one blame the wife who passionately loves and defends her husband's honor and her children's rights? Does one find fault with the woman who saves every penny for her boy's education or her girl's wedding dress?

The truth is that woman's virtues are out of place in the political arena only because they are so desperately in place elsewhere. It is said that the "dislocation of life in entire communities" is threatened by the numbers of young women who have enlisted in Mrs. Pankhurst's service. These young women are what the French call "detraquées." They are expending their "fierce, race-protecting passion" in the wrong direction, while the race is suffering from their delusion a consequent lack of health and well-being everywhere.

J. T. W.

NOT ELIGIBLE TO OFFICE

IT was the joyous dream of Illinois suffragists that, under the woman suffrage act, women would become immediately eligible for all offices for which they were permitted to vote.

This confidence has been rudely disturbed by an opinion given by Judge Owens, unofficially, on a question submitted by the Suffrage Bureau, apropos of the proposal to nominate a woman as alderman in the Twentieth Ward of Chicago.

The Judge, in his reply, said that the question was a debatable one, which should be decided officially. He directed attention to the fact that the legislature had failed to include in the act any provision for woman's holding office.

The common law of England has been in force in Illinois since the organization of the state, and was expressly reaffirmed by the legislature of 1874. Under the English common law, women were not permitted to hold public office. As early as 1869, the Supreme Court of Illinois held that a woman could not be a licensed attorney. Later, an act of the legislature expressly gave women this right; and in 1889 the legislature specifically gave women the right to hold school offices, thereby suspending the operation of the common law to this extent. But, when the legislature in 1872 passed the Woman's Employment Act, it was in these terms:

"No person shall be precluded or debarred from any occupation, profession or employment, except military, on account of sex; provided, *that this act shall not be construed to affect the eligibility of any person to an elective office.*"

It would appear from this that the legislature meant specifically to reserve "elective offices" from the scope of the act; and there is nothing in the new suffrage act which removes this exception.

A NEW CHILDREN'S CODE

THE Survey comments with satisfaction upon the fact that the first Children's Code in the world was enacted into law at the last session of the Ohio legislature.

The Code is extremely comprehensive. It empowers the State Board of Charities to investigate and supervise maternity hospitals and all institutions, public or private, which receive and care for children, and to receive as its wards such dependent or neglected or delinquent minors as shall be committed to it by the juvenile court; it provides a mother's allowance for the partial support of women whose husbands are dead or disabled or in prison, not to exceed $15 a month for the first child, and $7 a month for each other child under the age of 14; it requires the medical examination of school children; it makes education compulsory for boys from 8 to 15 and for girls from 8 to 16; it makes the minimum age for child labor 15 for boys and 16 for girls; and it gives to the Juvenile Court jurisdiction over cases of cruelty or neglect on the part of parents and also over persons contributing to the dependency or delinquency of children.

The Survey, with justifiable enthusiasm, hails this Code as "the Magna Charta of the children of Ohio" and predicts that it will undoubtedly form the basis of similar children's codes throughout the United States.

THE REMONSTRANCE may, perhaps, be pardoned if it notes the fact that this admirable Code is one of the latest specimens of "man-made laws" and that it was enacted by the legislature of a state the voters of which only last year rejected a proposed woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution by a majority of 87,455.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

WHEN Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, on a Sunday afternoon, carrying a red liberty cap, leads a mob of London hooligans and dock men in an attempt to storm Premier Asquith's house, and is somewhat bruised in the melée, is there any occasion for sympathy? If she acts like a hooligan, is there any good reason why she should not be treated like a hooligan?

MR. E. S. MARTIN'S keen, wise and witty articles upon American feminism, which first appeared in The Ladies' Home Journal, have been gathered together into a volume which D. Appleton & Co. publish under the title "The Unrest of Women." It would be hard to spend a dollar more wisely than in the purchase of this trenchant and sensible book.

ONLY a few weeks ago, the sympathy of the world was invited for Mrs. Pankhurst, who was represented as at death's door because of her self-inflicted sufferings in prison. Now American suffragists are planning to give her an ovation as a heroine and a martyr and have arranged an extensive speaking campaign for her in the United States. While thus glorifying and exploiting the chief inciter to militant crimes and violence, the burning of schools and churches and dwellings, the placing of bombs and all the rest, how can they expect to be believed when they explain that they are not in sympathy with her methods?

THE MASSACHUSETTS woman suffragists who went to Washington in automobiles the last of July to present petitions to the Senate received little encouragement from their Senators. Senator Lodge candidly told them that he was opposed to woman suffrage; and Senator Weeks not only told them that he should vote against the amendment, but advised them that the proper way to approach the question was through the states, where the right of suffrage should reside, and not through an amendment to the federal constitution. He added that he had never been associated with any woman, as a relative or as an employee or otherwise who wanted the ballot.

AN ENCOURAGING sign of the times is the organization at Buffalo of a Catholic Women's League which proposes to counteract the radical tendencies of the feminist movement, including the demand for the ballot. The League was organized at the annual convention of the German Roman Catholic Central Verein, and branches will be formed in all parts of the country. Mrs. Joseph Frey, the honorary president of the League, in explaining the purposes of the new organization, very truthfully says: "The feminist movement is being promoted by women whose views are decidedly pagan. If their demands were to be realized, the Christian family would cease to exist and woman's condition would lapse into paganism."

A HITCH IN NEW JERSEY

THE New Jersey Constitution directs that any proposed amendment, once accepted by the legislature, "shall be published for three months previous" to making the choice of a new legislature "in at least one newspaper in each county."

Under this explicit direction, the woman suffrage amendment should have been advertised throughout the state as early as the 4th of August,—three months prior to the November election. It was not until late in the month that it was discovered that this had not been done. The Attorney General gave it as his opinion that the amendment was invalidated by reason of this failure to comply with the constitutional requirements; but Governor Fielder on the 28th of August decided to go ahead, notwithstanding, with the advertising of the amendment.

The next thing the suffragists will need will be a Supreme Court which will rule that two months and seven days are the same thing as three months.

EQUAL HARDSHIPS WITH EQUAL RIGHTS

(Letter from "A Working Girl" in the Syracuse, N. Y., Herald.)

I AM an anti-suffragist because I believe that, unless women are lost to all sense of fair play, they will have to accept equal hardships with equal rights, else the term is a misnomer. Since women are apt to represent either potential or active motherhood, I believe they should always be a privileged class. I want them to have shorter working days than men and no night work, besides many other concessions from governments, because of their sex limitations.

The attempt on the part of the suffragists to hold on to every privilege which men have given them because of woman's weakness, and at the same time grasp at the ballot, is one of the most contemptible and dishonest of acts. Should it be successful, a sex aristocracy will prevail in the United States, instead of a democracy.

IS IT WORTH WHILE?

(Harold Owen in The Manchester Guardian.)

THOUGH the evil of married-women labor is one of the most glaring social ills of our time, that very evil is the feminist's ideal; and it is a logical necessity accepted by the suffragist in order to vindicate the claim for perfect equality and acquire the puny power of a vote.

Now everybody but a politician will inquire: "If it be necessary, in order to attain that equality which will justify the vote, to disestablish man as the bread-winner and turn all men and women into individual working units, and the children into State foster-mothered derelicts, is it worth while to burn down the house to secure the little roast pig?"

And everybody but the politician who talks about doing "a bare act of justice to women" by giving them the vote first and compelling them to live up to the equality implied in it afterwards, will ask whether, so far from doing the women an act of justice, we shall not be undoing all the work that civilization has done in differentiating more and more between the functions of men and women, throwing upon man the social burden of being the worker and the bread-winner whilst she bore the natural and unavoidable burden of replenishing the race.